

2/22/2000

I have previously commented on various inadequacies of the DEIS. Today I will raise more questions concerning the adequacy of this DEIS.

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2000

1 A DEIS public hearing is supposed to inform the public of the good and bad of the proposed project. DOE has gone out of their way to make sure that the general public is not informed. The "public hearing" are similar to a 3 act play. The first act is a sales pitch similar to the pitch for time shares, the second act puts the audience at ease by the question and answer period. An intermission helps to reduce the audience as many think they have given their comments and after the intermission the public hearing begins |

2 This document which, at first glance, looks like a document that is the work of unbiased authors. Upon reading this document one very quickly comes to the conclusion that the authors purposely have attempted to confuse the public. The DOE over the past year has attempted to convince the readers and anyone who would listen that the proper way to determine the suitability of this project was the "Total Systems Performance Assessment. The EIS in Volume 1 presents data that shows that in the eyes of the DOE the project is viable. On page 1-19 of volume 1 DOE states that the TSPA is based on the data available in 1998 DOE continues by stating "This EIS summarizes results from the Viability Assessment *where applicable* and data analysis that continued after the completion of the Viability Assessment.. That on the surface sounds like the results can be clearly stated for the Secretary of Energy to easily sign off on the safety of the proposed project. The EIS is supposed to be a document that can be understood by people outside of DOE. On page 1-19 volume 1 the DOE refers the reader to chapter 5. Table 5-1 on page 5-5 presents the average radionuclide inventory used for the performance assessment calculations.. One can see in this table the 1/2 lives of the material. I focus on this because DOE states that the data used in the computer runs is not an *exact* match with the inventory data in Appendix A. The values vary by a factor of over 100. Now I do not pretend to know how bad it is but when a simulation is conducted and is the basis of providing the Secretary of Energy the technical input that insure him that the project meets all the criteria for safety and health for the environment and humans, I expect that analysis to be the best it can be. When the data used is off by more than a factor of a hundred and this error occurs in a time period that will, (you notice I didn't say can) contaminate the earth and humans after the containers are gone, The assessment must be done with the latest data and clearly spell out why a radiation level of greater than 11 curries per package will not impact the human race for over a million years after the containers are gone. Would DOE bury that much material in the ground today? |

3 Now lets take this same material in a transportation cask and being transported on I-15 . As the cask approaches Cajon Pass on a windy day, a depleted uranium warhead pierces a cask. The energy provide by the velocity and mass of the warhead will not only vaporize the uranium warhead but will penetrate the cask and vaporize the material within the cask. The resultant dust cloud will be carried down wind covering a large area. The material that DOE was so concerned about and had enclosed in a very strong cask is now spreading on the water, land and people. Over 3000 curries will be spread on the ground for over 40,000 years and at least 11 curries for over a million years. DOE has not addressed this scenario which in today climate is a very credible scenario. The Hazmat teams have no solution and there is not insurance dollars available to clean up the disaster. This is the Achilles heel of this project. There is no safe way to transport the material as planned for this project. This DEIS seeps the problem under the rug by using average wind velocities and an average atmospheric model for the entire United States. |

4  
continued  
below

DOE has been forced to use antiquated techniques to solve a very serious problem, because assume DOE had had their hands and brains tied up by the political giants in Washington. It is conceded by both sides that the material stored where to it is today is safe for another 100 years. I propose that Congress untie the hands of DOE, establish a non-profit corporation that is not under the thumb of the NRC (which is politically supported by the nuclear power lobby) and is funded by Congress directly, not under the thumb of any agency. The make-up of the personnel will be scientist from all disciplines whose only goal is to find a way to safety dispose and/or use the nuclear waste already generated. They would have 50 years to come up with a solution that will be automatically funded and put into place in the following 50 years. The power companies that use nuclear power to generate electricity will pay back the government. I believe the public would have more faith in this method than the present method that is driven by near term profits and a total disregard for the health of future generations. The political and business leaders are not concerned about 100 generation in the future and as I have pointed out, if this plan is approved care less about people in the next 30 years who live in the area of the transportation highways and railways.

5

Maybe if the insurance liabilities limits were removed and the power companies forced to carry insurance that would cover an accident like I projected, the power companies and the Congress people in support of this project wouldn't be so positive. We have seen how well in the past oil tankers have been operated to protect the environment. There is absolutely no assurance from this poorly written DEIS that the DOE can plausible show how a terrorist attack using state of the art weapons will not cause a major disaster in an area like the Inland Empire.

4  
continued

DOE has got to stop being the lackey for the nuclear lobby and Congress and tell Congress that they may have made a big mistake by selecting Yucca Mountain and then attempting to force honest people to prostitute themselves. Stand up DOE and behave like scientists again not used car salespeople.

Lou deBottari  
1820 Citadel Circle  
Carson City, NV 89703